"That the Bill to amend the Vice-President's Pension Act,1997, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE. ENHANCEMENTOF RATE OF CUSTOMS DUTY ON WHEAT

Clarifications on Statement made by the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance on 1st December, 1999 regarding Imposition of Customs Duty on Wheat

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA) Sir, I move the following Resolution:

"That in pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 8A of theCustoms Tariff Act, 1975, read with sub-section (3) of section 7 ofthe said Act, this House hereby approves of Notification No.127/99 Customs dated 1.12.1999 (G.S.R. 793 (E) dated 1.12.1999) whichseeks to amend the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975so as to enhance the rate of customs duty applicable to goods falling under sub-heading Nos.1001.10 and 1001.20 of the said Schedule from "free" to "50%"

The question was proposed.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, we would like to seek some clarifications.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI) : Okay, we may take up the Statutory Resolution and the clarifications together.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Sir, this imposition of tax has definitely been done to ensure that no import is made. The question arises that prior to the imposition of this tax, there was import of wheat in abundance and, at that point of time, wheat was imported from outside, from the international market, at a price lower than the domestic price. As a result,

those who have imported wheat in abundance, even after relying on bank loans, stand to make a profit.

Now, a situation has come when if further import is allowed, those who have imported wheat may have to under-sell because the price is going down. The question which definitely arises is, why was wheat allowed to be imported at a point of time when the crop was not short and the country had enough wheat? What was the reason for allowing wheat at that point of time? Why, at that point of time, the mechanism of imposition of duty was not considered by the Government because, in the absence of any duty and because of the free trade policy, somebody imported wheat cheaply and sold it at a higher price. Therefore, two questions arise. Why was wheat allowed to be imported when we had enough wheat? Secondly, why are we imposing duty to prevent further import? Is it not that the same category of people who had been benefited earlier by importing wheat cheap will be benefited this time also by the imposition of duty? That is the question which arises. Because of this, a group of traders had made profit. Why didn't the Government take that into consideration? Why was there a difference in the price level, the national price and the international price? This is important because the peasants of this country had really been the loser, and it is because of this that the traders, who always have an eye on the price movement, taking advantage of the price difference, stand to gain. The hon. Minister may kindly take a little time to explain this paradox in the Government policy which has not benefitted either the producer or the consumer, but only those who had money to import wheat cheap and sell it at a higher price.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : Sir, I would like to seek a few clarifications from the hon. Finance Minister, if he kindly agrees, because, strictly speaking, it does not come within the purview of this Resolution, but I find that the hon. Minister recently had a discussion -- we read it in the newspapers -- with the visiting Chinese Finance Minister. Surely, in the course of the discussions, one important aspect relating to the duties on agricultural products might have come up for discussions because we are shortly going to face a major problem in regard to the access to Indian market by the exporters of foodgrains from other countries. Presently, we have a binding level which is almost prohibitive. Now, there is a pressure to reduce that binding level so that the minimum accessibility to Indian market in regard to agricultural products are permissible, and negotiation is going

on. My question to the Finance Minister is, whether he had any occassion to discuss this particular aspect because we have a commonality of interests with China. Here, in the international market, Ukraine group of countries is taking one view; the European Union is taking another view; the North American countries are taking a third view; we, the developing countries, who are conscious of maintaining our food security, have a totally different point of view. In that context, I would like to know from the hon. Finance Minister whether he could avail of this opportunity.

Sir, my second clarification is related to this specific Resolution. My question to the Finance Minister would be that a large number of items are on OGL and only through the tariff instrumentality the Government can control the unhealthy dumping or unhealthy import of these commodities in the country because the days of quantitative restrictions on import are gone and, perhaps, we cannot impose that. Therefore, the only mechanism which will be available to the Finance Minister is the tariffisation. I would like to know from the Minister whether he has been able to build up a mechanism within the Ministry to look into the market trends and make assessment; not just waiting for representations to come from different sections, whether they themselves could monitor the marke t trends, depending on the production ofvarious agricultural and other commodities, and institutionalising the monitoring arrangements through which effective tariffisation can take place.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I will put a very specific question. I am told that there was only one importer. The quantity imported was about 1.5 million tonnes. That involves a lot of money. I just want to know who are the people behind this miller - whether a small miller or a big miller - because I do not know any mill in the country which has the capacity to use 1.5 million tonnes. If imported, how did he fund such a large import bill? What kind of banking arrangements were made to import a million and a half tonnes by that miller? Was it for trading purpose or for his own plant? Because I cannot think of any plant in India which has that kind of a capacity.

श्री बालकवि बैरागी (मध्य प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने इस मुद्दे को पहले भी उठाया था और आज फिर मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि यह सारा गेहूं जो कि आयात किया गया है यह मई महीने से लेकर अक्तूबर के बीच का सिलसिला सारा का सारा है ---मई, ९९ से अक्तूबर, ९९ तक।

यह वह समय है जिसे हम कारगिल से लेकर के चुनाव तक का समय मानते हैं। यह मुद्दा समय-समय पर देश में विभिन्न स्थलों पर, विभन्न मंचों पर उठा है। इस पर बातें हुई हैं चर्चा हुई है। दो वित्त राज्य मंत्री उस दिन सदन मे इस प्रश्न का कोई उत्तर नहीं दे सके और सभापति जी ने और उपसभापति जी ने कृपा करके उनको समय दिया कि आप पूरी तैयारी करके आ जाइए। आज आप इसका उत्तर देने जा रहे हैं। मैं जानता हूं जैसे मल्होत्रा जी ने बताया, आप यह कह कर के टाल नहीं सकते इस सारे मामले को कि यह मेरे विभाग का मामला नहीं है, यह विभाग दूसरा है, हम तो केवल टेक्सेशन से संबधित मामलों के ही उत्तर देंगे। यह कह कर के अगर आप इस मामले को टालेंगे तो देश में एक तथ्य छिपा रह जाएगा। मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूं कि आयात करने वाले कौन-कौन व्यापारी थे, कहां-कहां के थे, किस-किस राज्य के थे, उन फर्मों के नाम क्या हैं, उन्होंने कितना-कितना गेहूं आयात किया, उस गेहूं के आयात करने के प्रबंधन की वित्तीय व्यवस्था कहां-कहां से की गई? यदि आप इन सारी बातें पर प्रकाश डालेंगे तो हम आपके बहुत आभारी रहेंगे और सारा तथ्य देश के सामने आ जाएगा। क्योंकि आयात-कर्ताओं ने खुले रूप से कहा है और मेरा वाक्य सदन के रिकार्ड में है, मैंने कहा था आयात-कर्ताओं ने तब भी कहा था कि हम अपना खेल खेल चुके, जब आपका खेल शुरू होने वाला होगा तब आप देख लेना। आखिर आप कौन सी चीज छिपाना चाहते हैं? इन सारे तथ्यों का दायित्व आपका है और आपके दायित्व की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करता हूं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे समय दिया मैं आपका बहुत आभारी हूं। धन्यवाद।

SHRI SURESH A. KESWANI (Maharashtra): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for giving me an opportunity to speak on this very important issue. This matter came up in the Rajya Sabha before also. Certain very pertinent questions were placed before the House and both hon. Ministers of State were unable to satisfy the House on the issue raised here. Subsequently, there was a discussion in the Lok Sabha, Sir, and hon. Agriculture Minister replied to the debate -- we have those debates with us -- and there it was said that, after all, liberalisation was a policy of the Congress Government and the present Government was merely continuing that policy and, that is how such a large import had taken place. It is also said here by the Minister of State for Finance that they have tried to protect the interests of the growers and a duty had been imposed to protect the interests of the growers, and they were not going to consider only the interests of consumers. We also have to look after the interests of the growers. This is what the

Minister had said. Sir, the issue, which I had raised in this House, was a very significant one. I would like to draw the attention, through you, of the Finance Minister to that issue. I want to know the date on which the decision was taken to impose 50 per cent customs duty. I want to know as to when and how this entire process of taking the decision and placing order for import of wheat on zero duty took place. I want to know the date on which the Finance Ministry concurred to allow this import of wheat on zero import duty. I want to know the date on which the proposal to impose 50 per cent import duty was initiated. I also want to know the place where this proposal originated. Whether it was in the Ministry of Food or the Ministry of Agriculture or the Ministry of Commerce or in any other place like the PMO, etc. The issue here is not just the duty, but the issue is the noting on the file in which the final decision was taken to impose the duty because the import has been effected after the date of initiating the proposal for imposition of 50 per cent customs duty. Sir, I will clarify once again. For instance, after the deal has been entered into with the so-called importers, they have been told that as soon as you import, the Government is going to impose 50 per cent customs duty on all subsequent imports. Thereafter, the LCs have been established for importing two million tonnes of wheat. During the course of this three-month period, the country has received, out of the two million tonnes, nearly 1.5 million tonnes of wheat. As soon as this last consignment has been received, the customs duty has been imposed at the rate of 50 per cent, resulting in straight appreciation of that imported wheat by 50 per cent. I am making an allegation in this House that those importers who have imported this wheat under the so-called deal have profiteered. There has been no inspection of this wheat. What is the quality of this wheat? It is of inferior quality. Originally, it has been imported at $ 70 to $ 80 per tonne. This wheat has been over-invoiced. Sir, as has been informed by the Minister in this House, the bills were for $120 to $ 150 CIF value per tonne. Whereas, the value of this kind of wheat is $ 70 to $ 80 per tonne. The Government is aware that this wheat has been certified to be unfit for human consumption. They have that evidence with them. Yet, no such disclosure is being made in this House. After this wheat was imported and after the duty has been imposed, the market price of that wheat has gone up. This wheat is finding its way to various bakeries and that maida goes down to the South and other locations where people are not so deserving and are not so used to the quality of wheat that Northen people are used to. I wish to submit before this House that it is a

very serious matter and a Committee of this House be constituted and it has to be allowed to inspect and see as to what has happened, before anybody tries to tamper with the available material. It is a very serious matter. A deal has taken place and this Government is squarely responsible for this. There is no other explanation as to why there should have been a 50 per cent duty on import of this wheat which has come, as a consignment, within a short period of three months which is so unnatural, on the face of it.

श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री महोदय से छोटा-सा प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूं और वह यह है कि क्या विश्व व्यापार संगठन के समझौते के चलते आपको गेहूं आयात करना एक बाध्यता है? अगर बाध्यता है तो कितना गेहूं आयात करने की बाध्यता है? अगर गेहूं का आयात होता रहता है तो क्या यह भी बाध्यता है कि प्रति वर्ष दशमलव सात प्रतिशत बढ़ोत्तरी के हिसाब से आयात करना पड़ेगा? इस नीति से, जो विश्व व्यापार संगठन के समझौते के मुताबिक आपने अगर की है तो अभी आप बतायेंगे कि गेहूं का आयात होगा और भी बहुत-सी चीजों का आयात होगा, तो क्या उससे हमारे किसानों को बहुत नुकसान नहीं होने वाला है? उनको कोई प्रोत्साहन मिलने वाला है? जब ऐसी ऐसी स्थितियां हैं तो किसान को हम लोग खेती से हटार्ने की कोशिश करा रहे हैं या उनको कोई प्रात्साहन देकर उनकी बढ़ोत्तरी की बात कर रहे हैं? श्रीमन् , आपके माध्यम से मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूं कि कि विश्व व्यापार संगठन के जरिए से इनकी किस हद तक बाध्यता है, कितना इन्हें गेहूं आयात करना है और अगर आयात करना है तो जो प्रतिवर्ष कुल .८ प्रतिशत बाध्यता इनके ऊपर है क्या इससे इन्हें हर साल आयात में बढ़ोत्तरी करनी पड़ेगी?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, in response to what Mr. Keswani has said, I would only plead that he has condemned and convicted us even before he heard the defence side. I would like to say, on behalf of the Government, that we have absolutely nothing to hide. If we had wanted to hide anything, then, I would not have come before this House with this Resolution.

As regards this Resolution, some Members, especially, Members like Pranabbabu, who have been in the Ministry of Finance, should know that this is a very special Resolution. Normally, what happens is that, if we make any change in customs or excise tariff, we come with a notification which is laid on the Table of the House; we don't come for approval. Why is it that I

have come to the House for approval by both Houses of Parliament, separately? This is not even a Money Bill, that if Rajya Sabha does not return it, then, it would automatically take effect after 14 days. I want the approval of the House to this Resolution because this is a very special Resolution. And, what is special about it? The special thing about this Resolution is that, over a period of time, the Finance Minister presents a Budget; there are certain tariff binding rates that he mentions in the Budget; that need not be the actual rate, but that is the binding rate that he accepts in the Budget. And, so, unless there is the approval of Parliament, I cannot exceed the binding rate; in this particular case, the bound rate for wheat imports in this country -- and I went back as far as I could, even as far as 1963-64 -- has been zero per cent all along. Sir, the import duty on wheat has been zero per cent. Why has it been zero per cent? It has been zero per cent because wheat has been imported on Government account all along, and also because we were importing it in a situation of shortage. Therefore, there was zero duty on it. Nobody else was importing it. Now, in December, 1996, -- we were not even in power at that time; but I have no wish to make it into a political issue -- the then Government decided that wheat would be allowed to be imported by roller flour mills. That was the decision that they had taken, and nothing was done about the duty. The duty continued to be zero. We were all aware that in 1996-97 and 1997-98, there was a panic. And the panic was because the total production of wheat had gone down by over 3 million tonnes. The Government of the day was concerned. Therefore, the Government of the day took some decisions. One of the decisions was that they would import some wheat. And the other decision was that they would allow the import of wheat by roller flour mills for their own use. It was on a actual user basis that the roller flour mills would import the wheat; then, they would mill the wheat and sell in the open market the wheat products like suji, maida, etc.

This was the arrangement. Now, it is another matter that the 1997-98 wheat crop turned out to be a very good crop we produced something like 66 million tonnes. In April, last year, we produced 71 million tonnes. Therefore, when the Vajpayee Government came into office last time, in the third week of March, we reviewed the situation immediately and put a stop on the import of wheat. 1.4 million tonnes of wheat had been imported as against the decision of the then Government, taken at the level of the Prime Minister; subsequently ratified by the Cabinet, that 2 million tonnes of wheat will be imported. Looking at the prospect of the crop, we decided to

put a stop then and there, and 1.4 million tonnes of wheat was imported. Now, what was happening on the private front the roller flour mills? The roller flour mills were importing small quantities of wheat; that was not a large quantity of wheat. And they represented to the Ministry of Commerce that because they were importing small quantities of wheat, they were not able to negotiate these contracts in the international market, and, therefore, would the Government please permit them to import through Government agencies, namely, the STC, the MMTC, and the Project Equipment Corporation (PEC). This decision was taken in 1998 -- if the roller flour mills placed in indent on these agencies, then these agencies will go and import on their behalf, the consignments will be released by them; payments will be made by them, and they will take it to their mills. They will further process it. Then, they will dispose of the wheat products. This is how the arrangement was made. Gurudasji was raising a point, "Large quantities of wheat have been imported. What is the quantity that has been imported?" This year again, from the information that the Ministry of Agriculture has, we are expecting another good crop of wheat. Therefore, there will be a problem later -- next year -- when we start procuring wheat because we want to continue with the procurement of wheat in order to help farmers. Therefore, when we will procure wheat, there will be a problem because the godowns are full at this point of time. Therefore, we have to think in terms of as to how we should tackle the problem so that we have enough space available in our godowns to take care of the wheat which will be procured in the next procurement season starting May, next year. That is how we review the situation. Now, what was the quantity of wheat imported during the last few months? It was 1.5 million tonnes. Total wheat imported in the full calendar year 1999 was 2 million tonnes. That was the import. Now, if we look at the total market, 71 million tonnes was the production, and 2 million tonnes were imported. And what are the figures of the month-wise? It was mentioned here that May to October were the critical, culprit, month when we allowed large imports. I have the month-wise figures - May 99: 53000 tonnes, June1999: 89,000 tonnes, August1999: 3,03,000 tonnes, October 1999: 4,07,000 tonnes. You will notice from here that up to July, the imports were within limits, that is, 1,62,000 tonnes. In August, September and October, it was roughly 10 lakh tonnes, or a million tonne of wheat had been imported.

Now, so far as this year is concerned, Mr. Jayant Malhoutra was saying that there was only one importer. He asked: How did he make

arrangements? Which bank came to his rescue? I have a list here, Sir. This is a list of the roller flour mills on whose behalf the MMTC and the PEC had imported wheat. Because this list is in a different category, I asked my colleague to make the total for me. 160 roller flour mills have imported varying quantities of wheat during this period of time.

Not one, not two, not fourteen, it is 160. This is the list of the importers. Now, why? Because Roller Flour Mills were allowed to import freely, they imported freely. When things are freely imported -- and that is what the notification of the Commerce Ministry says, "things are freely imported and they are on O.G.L". Sir, the Government does not keep account except for purposes of trade of how much has been imported. The Reserve Bank keeps an account of inflows and outflows of foreign exchange, and the Commerce Ministry keeps an account through the Director General of Statistics as to how much is being imported. These are the figures. So, the figures are not being made available to us on a daily-basis. The second issue is as to why we did not do it earlier. Why? Sir, it is because this is a very special arrangement which we normally would not do. I remember, on 12th of July the code of conduct came into operation for the elections. I checked up, between the 12th of July and until the new Government came into position, as to what the kind of notification was that was issued on the customs and excise front. Did we take any policy decision? Sir, I have satisfied myself that apart from responding to the court decisions, apart from making technical corrections, we have not, in the Finance Ministry, changed any tariff rate either on the customs or on the excise front which had a policy implication because the code of conduct was in operation. If the situation was going out of hand, then, maybe, I would have had come to this House and said, "Look, I am guilty that despite the code of conduct being in operation, I have taken this policy decision of imposing a duty of 50% on wheat." I would have come and pleaded like this before that House and before this House. But the point I am making is that it was only in the month of October that four lakh tonnes of wheat was imported. We reviewed the situation immediately after we returned to power, we reviewed the situation and came to the conclusion, and looking at the future prospect - in the meanwhile we had a good idea of the next year's crop also and we decided that we must take steps in order to discourage the import of wheat -- the Government decided to impose this duty of 50%. Now, Mr. Keswani has asked; "which file, which Cabinet. which this, which that?" All these things

are here. The records are here, but I will only plead that unless there are specific complaints, do we get into all these things? Do we ask the Government to show files regarding when the decision was taken, when the Cabinet decided, and when the Cabinet Committee decided? I would like to assure the House that we discussed this matter and the moment the decision was taken that we should discourage the import of wheat -- we looked at our own godowns, the stocks that we held and the future prospect of the next year's crop -- we immediately took steps to impose a duty of 50%. Now, why 50%? The GATT rate is 100%. We decided to impose 50% because we made calculations and we found that 50% duty will take the imported wheat even beyond the locally available wheat. That is why we settled for 50%. So, Sir, I would like to say that unless we are in league, the Government is in league, with hundreds of importers, the Roller Floor Mills and all that of kind things, and we indulge in corruption on a large scale, this kind of thing will not happen. Mr. Keswani was referring to these things and he even demanded a House Committee. So, I have to clarify that point. Therefore, Sir, this is the situation which has arisen and we have taken steps. Shri Gurudas Dasji has referred to farmers. The farmer's interest is not suffering at all because whatever had to be procured at a significantly higher support price of Rs. 550/-, it was done. We had procured at that price. Why are our godowns full? Our godowns are full because we have given support prices to farmers and taken from them whatever was their disposal surplus. So, there is nothing for the farmers to suffer. Farmers have been fully taken care of in this. Sir, Pranab Babu raised the point about my meeting with the Chinese Vice Minister yesterday. I would only like to say that at my level it was only in the nature of a courtesy call. The Chinese Vice Minister spent about an hour and a half with me. We discussed a range of issues. He has come here basically to forge a greater co-operation between the two Governments, especially between the two Finance Ministries of the two countries. At the official level, discussions have been held on a wide range of issues. When the Chinese Vice Minister called on me, we discussed various issues including the issue of co-operation between the two countries at the international for a, the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO. When China becomes a member of the WTO, we are looking forward to Chinese support to the cause of the developing countries as a whole. I want to tell the House that Chinese are fully on board as far as the case and the cause of the developing countries are concerned. I am sure that is how they will operate in the WTO also. I would

like to tell the House that in Berlin where I was with the permission of the House last week for the meeting of the G-20 Finance Ministers, all the emerging countries, including China, were working in close co-operation in tandem. Therefore, that will continue to be the attitude of the countries.

With these words, I suggest that there is nothing hanky panky about this. It is a clean deal. We have taken steps at the right time. The idea is to discourage the imports of wheat because our own situation is very good.

I want to end by saying that there is a school of thought which believes that imports and exports should be allowed freely and that we should not turn the tap on and off, according to our own requirements. There is a strong school of thought, which believes in that. The whole WTO arrangement is going to be based on that. Therefore, that is also a school of thought that this House may like to consider at some future date. We need another debate for that.

I suggest to the House that this Resolution be adopted.

श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक : माननीय मंत्री जी ने मेरे सवाल का जवाब नहीं दिया कि विश्व व्यापार संगठन से कितनी बाध्यता है गेहूं आयात करने की और वह क्या .८ प्रतिशत प्रति वर्ष बढ़ाने की भी है?

श्री यशवन्त सिन्हा : मैं माननीय सदस्य महोदय से कहना चाहूंगा कि यह सारा मामला अभी डिसकशन में है। इस पर अंतिम फैसला नहीं हुआ है। डब्ल्यू०टी०ओ० में, माराकेश में जो समझौता हुआ था उसके अनुसार - विप्लव बाबू भी उस डेलीगेशन में गए थे - मैन्डेटेड नेगोशिएशंस हैं सर्विसेज में और एग्रीकल्चर पर। वे नेगोशिएशंस आगे होंगे और तब यह सारा कुछ तय होगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सनातन बिसि) : बस हो गया। मल्होत्रा जी आपका क्या है। रिपीट मत कीजिए।

SHRI SURESH A. KESWANI: Sir, the Minister has said that there were 160 importers. ..... *(Interruptions)* ....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): No, no, he has already clarified all those things. Please, please.

SHRI SURESH A. KESWANI: Not to my satisfaction.

My point is that he has said that there are 160 importers and that,

therefore, this is a very wide import. He has been in the Finance Minister. This is not the first time that he is here. He knows that this country is used to these front companies. He also knows that the PEC, the STC and the MMTC also operate virtually as conduits, through which, one party imports take place. ...*(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, this point should not go unreplied to. On this, if the Member has any information that not only any of these 160 companies but also any other company was acting as a front and he shares that information with the Government, the Government will not hesitate to take the sternest possible action.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: Sir, I have raised a small point.

The hon. Minister has said that the average imports before August-September-October, were about 70,000 to 80,000 tonnes. It is true that the information on imports does not come on a daily basis. However, it is also true that it comes on a monthly basis. From August-September-October, it jumped four to five times, to three lakhs or four lakhs. I do not think that we should wait for three or four months to act.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI): I shall now put the Statutory Resolution to vote.

The question is:

> "That in pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 8A of the Customs Tariff Act, 1975, read with sub-section (3) of section 7 of the said Act, this House hereby approves of Notification No.127/99-Customs dated 1.12.1999 (G.S.R.793 (E) dated 1.12.1999) which seeks to amend the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 so as to enhance the rate of customs duty applicable to goods falling under sub-heading Nos. 1001.10 and 1001.20 of the said Schedule from "free" to "50"%".

The motion was adopted.

THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR WELFARE OF PERSONS WITH AUTISM, CEREBRAL PALSY, MENTAL RETARDATION AND MULTIPLE DISABILITIES BILL, 1999

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANATAN BISI) : We now take up the National Trust for Welfare of Persons with Autism, Cerebral Palsy,